



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/606,845	06/27/2003	Hyou Takahashi	Q76336	4812

23373 7590 12/02/2005

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

LE, HOA VAN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1752

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/606,845

Applicant(s)

TAKAHASHI ET AL.

Examiner

Hoa V. Le

Art Unit

1752

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1,5,7,8,11 and 13-16 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-4,6,9-10,12,17-20 and 21 with respect to the elected and applied species is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

This is in response to Paper filed on 29 August 2005. Up to date 29 November 2005, the record shows that there is no new evidence or material for a patentability of the previously rejected claims being submitted during a requested three months suspension period.

I. The record shows that applicants elect the invention of Group II, claims 2-4, 6, 9-10, 12, 17-20 and 21, without traverse being acknowledged.

II. The record also shows that applicants elect species of (a) compound A-1 for the chemical structure of the general formula (1) and its counter ion, (b) MM-1 as crosslinking agent, (c) OE-2 nitrogen-containing basic compound and (d) R-20 (tri-unit repeating copolymer) as both (*) alkali-soluble resin and (**) resin capable of...of an acid.

III. The elected species have been considered and searched. The consideration and search are extended to the applied species. Others have not been considered or searched until the elected and applied species are overcome.

Art Unit: 1752

IV. The language “resin capable of...of an acid”, “compound capable of...of an acid”, “nitrogen-containing basic compound” or the like is considered as property of a material and searched as appeared. For a property of a material it is applied in accordance with the authority stated in *In re Schreiber*, 44 USPQ2d 1429 with “A patent applicant is free to recite features of an apparatus either structurally or functionally. See *In re Swinehart*...169 USPQ 226, 228...Yet, choosing to define an element functionally, i.e., by what it does, carries with a risk. As our predecessor court state in *Swinehart*...where the Patent Office has reasons that the functional limitation asserted to be critical for establishing novelty in the claimed subject mater may, in fact, be an inherent characteristic of the prior art, it possesses the authority to require the applicant to prove that the subject matter shown to be in the prior art does not possess the characteristic relied on.” A statement or argument alone may have and be given a little to no value because it is not factual evidence.

V. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See

Art Unit: 1752

In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

The elected invention of claims 2, 6, 9-10, 12, 17-20 and 21 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 2-8 and 16 (being related to “positive resist composition” as claimed in the instantly claimed composition) of copending Application No. 10/361,505. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they contain the same or about the same requisite chemical ingredients. The applied claims do not limit to “from 3.6 to 15 wt%” of an acid generating agent as that in the instant claim. Since there is no concentration is disclosed in the applied claims, it is properly considered at any possibly broad amount that would encompass the limited amount in the instant claims *as generally assumed in the art*. Applicants

Art Unit: 1752

should show or provide a convincing evidence to the contrary. However, evidence can be seen in application 10/361,505 that an amount from 0.1 to 40 wt% is disclosed on page 33, first paragraph. The applied "BP" polymer includes the repeating units of formulas "X1" and "X2" on page 96 of the application is read on the resin "D" with the repeating units formulas "IV" and "V" in the instant claim 3. The applied polymers, B(15, 22, 25 and 28-37), have a repeating unit ratio of 1:1 to 1:2 on pages 101-106 of the applied application that is read on the ratio of "IV"/"V" in claim 4.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Applicant's arguments filed 19 July 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants urge that the applied claims is not limited to "from 3.6 to 15 wt%" of an acid generating agent as that in the instant claim. Since there is no concentration is disclosed in the applied claims, it is properly considered at any possibly broad amount that would encompass the limited amount in the instant claims *as generally assumed in the art*. Applicants should show or provide a convincing evidence to the contrary. However, evidence can be seen in application

Art Unit: 1752

10/361,505 that an amount from 0.1 to 40 wt% is disclosed on page 33, first paragraph. The applied "BP" polymer includes the repeating units of formulas "X1" and "X2" on page 96 of the application is read on the resin "D" with the repeating units formulas "IV" and "V" in the instant claim 3. The applied polymers, B(15, 22, 25 and 28-37), have a repeating unit ratio of 1:1 to 1:2 on page 101-106 of the applied application that is read on the ratio of "IV"/"V" in claim 4. *A claim may be allowable* if applicants, Fuji Photo and/or their counsel may also state for the record that no citation of an amount of a chemical ingredient in a claim means zero amount for the patentability of a claim *as urged on the record*.

VI. The elected invention of claims 2, 6, 9-10, 12, 17-20 and 21 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 17-20 of copending Application 10/613,044 as amended on 22 February 2005 . Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they (1) contain the same or about the same requisite chemical ingredients including the polymer type as claimed. The applied claims do not limit to "from 3.6 to 15 wt%" of an acid generating agent as that in the instant claim. Since there is no concentration is disclosed in the applied claims, it is properly considered at

Art Unit: 1752

any possibly broad amount that would encompass the limited amount in the instant claims *as generally assumed in the art*. Applicants should show or provide a convincing evidence to the contrary. However, evidence can be seen in application 10/613,044 that an amount from 0.1 to 20 wt% is disclosed on page 98, second paragraph. The applied "D2" resin includes the repeating units being read on the repeating units formulas "IV" and "V" in the instant claim 3 with the applied resins, B(15, 22, 25 and 28-37). They have a repeating unit ratio of 1:1 to 1:2 on pages 144-152 of the applied application that is read on the ratio of "IV"/"V" in claim 4.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Applicant's arguments filed 29 July 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claim 13 or 16 is not applied on the record.

Applicants urge that the applied claims is not limited to "from 3.6 to 15 wt%" of an acid generating agent as that in the instant claim. Since there is no concentration is disclosed in the applied claims, it is properly considered at any possibly broad amount that would encompass the limited amount in the instant

Art Unit: 1752

claims *as generally assumed in the art*. Applicants should show or provide a convincing evidence to the contrary. However, evidence can be seen in application 10/361,505 that an amount from 0.1 to 20 wt% is disclosed on page 98, second paragraph. The applied "D2" resin includes the repeating units being read on the repeating units formulas "IV" and "V" in the instant claim 3 with the applied resins, B(15, 22, 25 and 28-37). They have a repeating unit ratio of 1:1 to 1:2 on pages 144-152 of the applied reference that is read on the ratio of "IV"/"V" in claim 4. *A claim may be allowable* if applicants, Fuji Photo and/or their counsel may also state for the record that no citation of an amount of a chemical ingredient in a claim means zero amount for the patentability of a claim *as urged on the record*.

VII. The elected invention of claims 2-4, 6, 9-10, 12, 17-20 and 21 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 3-4, 6, 8, 11-12, 14, 16, and 18 of Copending Application 10/654,942 as recognized by applicants. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they contain the same or about the same requisite chemical ingredients . The applied claims do not limit to "from 3.6 to 15 wt%" of an acid generating

Art Unit: 1752

agent as that in the instant claim. Since there is no concentration is disclosed in the applied claims, it is properly considered at any possibly broad amount that would encompass the limited amount in the instant claims *as generally assumed in the art*. Applicants should show or provide a convincing evidence to the contrary.

However, evidence can be seen in application 10/654,942 that an amount from 0.1 to 20 wt% is disclosed on page 27, second paragraph. The resin "E" in the applied claims broadly includes those in formulas "IV" and "V" in the instant claim 3 together with their ratio in the instant claim 4 at pages 83 and 86 third paragraph of the applied application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Applicant's arguments filed 29 July 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants urge that the applied claims is not limited to "from 3.6 to 15 wt%" of an acid generating agent as that in the instant claim. Since there is no concentration is disclosed in the applied claims, it is properly considered at any possibly broad amount that would encompass the limited amount in the instant claims *as generally assumed in the art*. Applicants should show or provide a

Art Unit: 1752

convincing evidence to the contrary. However, evidence can be seen in application 10/654,942 with an amount from 0.1 to 20 wt% being disclosed on page 27, second paragraph. The resin "E" in the applied claims broadly includes those in formulas "IV" and "V" in the instant claim 3 together with their ratio in the instant claim 4 at pages 83 and 86 third paragraph of the applied application. *A claim may be allowable* if applicants, Fuji Photo and/or their counsel may also state for the record that no citation of an amount of a chemical ingredient in a claim means zero amount for the patentability of a claim *as urged on the record*.

A claim would have no value if it is found to be read on or within applicants' or Fuji's application claim without a terminal disclaimer.

VIII. The showings under Rule 132 filed on 29 July 2005 has been fully considered but are not found to be convincing since there is no evidence on the record that:

(1) no citation of an amount of a chemical ingredient in a claim means zero amount. However, a *claim may be allowable* if applicants, Fuji Photo and/or their counsel may also state for the record that no citation of an amount of a chemical ingredient in a claim means zero amount for the patentability of a claim *as urged on the record*;

Art Unit: 1752

(2) all of the applied claims have been limited to exclude from about 3.44 to about 15.3 wt% of compound “(A)”;

(3) the instant claims have been limited to from about 3.83 to about 14.6 wt% of compound “(A)” in order for the showings to have some merits. Otherwise, they have and are given little to no value with respect to the claimed amount over the applied claimed in the applied applications on the record.

IX. The elected invention of claims 2, 6, 9-10, 12, 17-20 and 21 with respect to the elected and applied species are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sinta et al (5,731,364 as submitted) and Sato et al (6,238,842).

Sinta et al disclose, teach and suggest a positive resist composition comprising about 5% (based on weight of a resin) of disulfonium and their counter ions (Sinta et al at col.1:58 and 62 to 2:9 and 43-60, 3:8-18, and 24-38, 4:23 to 5:32) being read within the general formula I as claimed and resin being read on the type as claimed (Sinta et al at col.8:31 to 9:51).

Sinta et al do not specify a nitrogen containing basic compound in the instant claim 6. Sato et al is cited to show the known use of chemical ingredients, especially at col.149:27 to 150:40 to show nitrogen-containing basic compound. It

Art Unit: 1752

has stronger basic than phenol for accelerating dissolution in an alkaline developing solution.

Since the above references are related to positive photoresist compositions, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use, include or cite a nitrogen-containing compound from Sato et al in Sinta et al positive photoresist compositions for reasonable expectation of obtaining rapid image development as disclosed, taught and suggested in Sinta et al.

Applicant's arguments filed 29 July 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claims 3 and 4 are not rejected over a prior art above and withdrawn from consideration for now because they are not the elected resin "R-20" on the record. It is only required that they will be considered and searched when all of the applied resin on the record are overcome.

Compounds of the general formula (V) on column 2, lines 43-60 and column 3, lines 8-18 are read on the general acid precursors under "(A)" in the claims.

Art Unit: 1752

X. This is in response to Request for Continued Examination filed on 29 August 2005. All elected, searched and examined claims are drawn to the same invention. They are properly rejected on the grounds and art of record and made FINAL. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

XI. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hoa V. Le whose telephone number is 571-272-1332.

The examiner can normally be reached from 6:30 AM to 4:30 PM on Monday through Thursday and about the same time of most Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cynthia Kelly can be reached on 571-272-1526.

Applicants may file a paper by (1) fax with a central facsimile receiving number 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hoa V. Le
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1752

HVL
29 November 2005

HOA VAN LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
